

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 8, 10, 14 through 18, and 19 through 32 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 10, and 19 through 32 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 is independent. Claims 2 through 7 depend from claim 1. Claim 14 is independent. Claims 15 through 18 depend from claim 14.

In the Action, claim 15 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as the claim element of "the connectors" lack proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 15 so that claim 15 conforms with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and has proper antecedent basis. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Action, claims 1 through 4, and 7 were rejected under U.S. Patent No. 3,797,109 to Yamada et al. ("Yamada"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that Yamada neither expressly nor inherently discloses all of the elements set forth in independent claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, provides for a hair clipper. The hair clipper has a clipper head having a cutting assembly and a handle having a longitudinal axis. The hair clipper also has a head connector for connecting the clipper head and the handle so that the clipper head pivots about an axis of rotation that is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the handle and offset from the cutting assembly.

The hair clipper also has a flat lever surface. The flat lever surface is located on a side of the axis of rotation and

opposite the cutting assembly. The clipper head is selectively positioned in any one of a number of preset pivot positions by application of a force to a surface located on a side of the axis of rotation opposite the cutting assembly. The flat lever surface enables easy rotation of the clipper head.

Yamada discloses an electric shaver, not a hair clipper. The electric shaver has a body with a first arm and a second arm. A first bolt and a second bolt connects each of the first arm and the second arm to a shaving head that is rockably supported therebetween. The shaving head has a blade. This allows the user to adjust the shaving head in a rockable manner. This ensures that shaving is made in a comfortable position while keeping a surface of the blade in close contact with the skin. The surface underneath the shaving head between the shaving head and handle has a number of grooves.

Yamada does not disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a head connector for connecting a clipper head and the handle so that the clipper head pivots about an axis of rotation that is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the handle and offset from the cutting assembly. Yamada also does not disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a flat lever surface located on a side of the axis of rotation and opposite the cutting assembly with the flat lever surface enabling easy rotation of the clipper head. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested. Claims 2 through 4, and 7 are also patentable over Yamada as these claims depend from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 through 4, and 7 are requested.

In the Action, claim 14 was rejected under U.S. Patent No. Re. 22,638 to Kleinman (hereinafter "Kleinman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that Kleinman neither expressly nor inherently discloses all of the elements set forth in independent claim 14.

Claim 14 discloses a hair clipper that has a clipper head with pivot points positioned on opposite sides of the head and define a pivot axis. The clipper has a stationary blade having teeth, and a reciprocating blade having teeth. The teeth of the stationary blade are substantially parallel to the teeth of the reciprocating blade and form a cutting edge.

The hair clipper also has a handle with a longitudinal axis and a pair of support arms with each support arm being pivotally connected to a respective one of the pivot points. The hair clipper also has a motor and a drive system for reciprocating the reciprocating blade such that hair positioned within the teeth of the stationary blade are cut by the cutting edge.

The clipper head has a flat lever surface and the flat lever surface is located between the cutting edge, and an end of the handle. The cutting edge is located on the head at a distal position from the pivot axis and the flat lever surface facilitates easy pivoting of the clipper head.

Kleinman discloses a shaver. The shaver has a stationary blade and a reciprocating blade with the reciprocating blade moving relative to the stationary blade to provide a number of shearing teeth. The shaver has a recessed section with a number of slots. The recessed section when contacting the face causes the face to bulge outwardly a predetermined amount and the hair

may be then cut by the number of shearing teeth at an acute angle. (See page 6, column 2, lines 34 through 53).

Kleinman does not disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a handle and a pair of support arms with each support arm pivotally connected to a respective one of the pivot points. Kleinman also clearly does not disclose or suggest any clipper head with a flat lever surface located between the cutting edge, and an end of the handle with the cutting edge located on the head at a distal position from the pivot axis, let alone any flat lever surface to facilitate easy pivoting of the clipper head. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 are respectfully requested.

In the Action, claims 1 through 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Yamada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,093,991 to Hendrickson (hereinafter "Hendrickson").

In response, applicant submits that the cited and relied upon Yamada and Hendrickson do not support a prima facie rejection of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant submits that Yamada alone or in combination with Hendrickson neither discloses nor suggests applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that there is no disclosure, suggestion or motivation in either reference for the modification argued by the Office, and that Yamada, Hendrickson, and the combination thereof, even if technically feasible, which is not admitted as possible, do not render applicant's claimed invention obvious.

Hendrickson discloses an adjustment safety razor. The safety razor has a handle connected to a shaving razor assembly.

The safety razor also has a biasing device that is a disc spring. The biasing device that allows the shaving razor assembly to move or rotate in a circular manner around an axis of the handle. Clearly, this is not a hair clipper and applicant contends that it is non-analogous art for the purposes of combining with the primary reference.

Yamada, Hendrickson and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a head connector for connecting a clipper head and the handle so that the clipper head pivots about an axis of rotation that is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the handle and offset from the cutting assembly, let alone having any flat lever surface located on a side of the axis of rotation and opposite the cutting assembly with the flat lever surface enabling easy rotation of the clipper head. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 are respectfully requested. Claims 2 through 7 are also patentable over Yamada as these claims depend from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 2 through 7 are respectfully requested.

In the Action, claims 1 through 4, 7, and 14 through 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman in view of Yamada, and further in view of United States Patent No.: 2,119,792 to Parkin (hereinafter "Parkin"). In response, applicant submits that the cited and relied upon Kleinman, Yamada and Parkin do not support a prima facie rejection of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant submits that Kleinman alone or in combination with Yamada or Parkin neither discloses nor suggests applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection on the grounds that there is no disclosure, suggestion or motivation in any reference for the modification argued by the Office, and that Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin, and the combination thereof, even if technically feasible, which is not admitted as possible, do not render applicant's claimed invention obvious.

Parkin discloses a razor with an adjustable handle. The adjustable handle has a number of threads therein. The handle also has another element for engagement with the number of threads. The razor further has a blade holder that has an extension. The extension is a bifurcated spherical member and connects with the adjustable handle.

Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest independent claim 1.

Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a head connector for connecting a clipper head and the handle so that the clipper head pivots about an axis of rotation that is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the handle and offset from the cutting assembly, let alone having any flat lever surface located on a side of the axis of rotation and opposite the cutting assembly with the flat lever surface enabling easy rotation of the clipper head. Parkin does not pivot as claimed, but instead has a number of grooves that fit into the element for adjusting the handle. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. Claims 2 through 4, and 7 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 14 discloses a hair clipper with a clipper head having pivot points positioned on opposite sides of the head defining a pivot axis, a stationary blade having teeth, and a reciprocating blade having teeth. The teeth of the stationary blade are substantially parallel to the teeth of the reciprocating blade and form a cutting edge.

The hair clipper also has a handle having a longitudinal axis, and a pair of support arms. Each support arm is pivotally connected to a respective one of the pivot points. The hair clipper also has a motor and a drive system for reciprocating the reciprocating blade such that hair positioned within the teeth of the stationary blade are cut by the cutting edge. The clipper head has a flat lever surface with the flat lever surface located between the cutting edge, and an end of the handle. The cutting edge is located on the head at a distal position from the pivot axis, and the flat lever surface facilitates easy pivoting of the clipper head.

Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin, and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest support arms pivotally connected to a respective one of the pivot points with the hair clipper having a motor and a drive system for reciprocating the reciprocating blade such that hair positioned within the teeth of the stationary blade are cut by the cutting edge. Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin, and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest any clipper head having a flat lever surface with the flat lever surface located between the cutting edge, and an end of the handle.

Kleinman, Yamada, Parkin, and the combination thereof do not disclose or suggest that the cutting edge is located on the

head at a distal position from the pivot axis, and the flat lever surface facilitates easy pivoting of the clipper head. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 are respectfully requested. Claims 15 through 16 are also patentable over the cited references as these claims depend from claim 14.

In the Action, claims 1 through 7, and 14 through 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman in view of Hendrickson, and Yamada, and further in view of Parkin. In response, applicant submits that the cited and relied upon Kleinman, Hendrickson, Yamada and Parkin do not support a *prima facie* rejection of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant submits that Kleinman alone or in combination with Hendrickson, Yamada and Parkin, neither discloses nor suggests applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the grounds that there is no disclosure, suggestion or motivation in any reference for the modification argued by the Office, and that Kleinman, Hendrickson, Yamada, Parkin, and the combination thereof, even if technically feasible, which is not admitted as possible, do not render applicant's claimed invention obvious.

None of the cited and relied upon references disclose or suggest any hair clipper with a head connector for connecting a clipper head and the handle so that the clipper head pivots about an axis of rotation that is perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the handle and offset from the cutting assembly, let alone having any flat lever surface located on a side of the axis of rotation and opposite the cutting assembly.

None of the cited and relied upon references disclose or suggest any flat lever surface enabling easy rotation of the clipper head as claimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested. Claims 2 through 7 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of claim 14, none of the cited and relied upon references disclose or suggest any support arms pivotally connected to a respective one of the pivot points with the hair clipper having a motor and a drive system for reciprocating the reciprocating blade such that hair positioned within the teeth of the stationary blade are cut by the cutting edge and the clipper head, let alone any hair clipper having a flat lever surface. None of the cited and relied upon references disclose or suggest any flat lever surface located between the cutting edge, and an end of the handle. None of the cited and relied upon references disclose or suggest any cutting edge located on the head at a distal position from the pivot axis, and the flat lever surface facilitating easy pivoting of the clipper head. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 are respectfully requested. Claims 15 through 18 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above for claim 14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the present pending claims are clearly patentable over each cited reference and the cited combinations of the same. Thus, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/085,722
Art Unit: 3724

Dated:

January 18, 2005

Charles N.J. Ruggiero

Charles N.J. Ruggiero, Esq.
Registration No. 28,468
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401